

J L MANN HIGH

61 Isbell Lane
Greenville, South Carolina 29607

GRADES 9-12 High School

ENROLLMENT 1,154 Students

PRINCIPAL Susan F. Hughes 864-281-1152

SUPERINTENDENT Dr. William E. Harner 864-241-3456

BOARD CHAIR Tommie E. Reece 864-271-3619

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

2003

ABSOLUTE RATING:

EXCELLENT

Absolute Ratings of High Schools with Students like Ours

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
16	5	0	0	0

IMPROVEMENT RATING:

GOOD

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS:

N/A

SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL

By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT:

WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM

WWW.SCEOC.ORG

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Excellent	Excellent	N/A
2002	Excellent	Excellent	N/A
2003	Excellent	Good	N/A
2004			

TENTH GRADE PASSAGE OF ONE OR MORE SUBTESTS OF THE EXIT EXAM

	Our School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Percent	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
Passed all 3 subtests	73.4	75.1	77.2	75.6	74.1	73.5
Passed 2 subtests	14.9	14.1	9.5	14.4	14.7	14.8
Passed 1 subtest	5.4	7.6	9.1	7.0	7.3	7.0
Passed no subtests	6.2	3.2	4.3	3.0	3.9	3.9

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS

	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003		Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships*		Graduation Rate	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
All Students	216	95.8	205	34.6	235	79.1
Gender						
Male	109	96.3	96	43.8	116	73.3
Female	107	95.3	109	26.6	119	84.9
Race or Ethnic Group						
African American	63	88.9	58	3.4	75	62.7
Hispanic	5	100.0	4	I/S	7	57.1
White	140	98.6	134	49.3	144	88.2
Other	8	100.0	9	33.3	9	88.9
Disability Status						
Non-speech disabilities	23	91.3	28	0.0	32	28.1
Students without disabilities	193	96.4	177	40.1	203	87.2
Migrant Status						
Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Non-migrant	214	95.8	205	34.6	0	N/A
English Proficiency						
Limited English proficient	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	2	I/S
Non-LEP	214	95.8	205	34.6	233	79.8
Lunch Status						
Subsidized meals	29	86.2	36	2.8	49	34.7
Full-pay meals	187	97.3	169	41.4	186	90.9

n = number of students on which percentage is calculated

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIPS

Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	34.6	22.4
Seniors who met the SAT requirement	34.6	23.8
Seniors who met the grade point average	67.8	55.7

*Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

SCHOOL PROFILE

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
Students (n= 1,154)				
Retention rate	6.8%	Down from 9.4%	7.4%	7.3%
Attendance rate	96.5%	Up from 96.1%	95.7%	95.5%
Eligible for gifted and talented	0.0%	Down from 15.6%	8.8%	5.1%
With disabilities other than speech	12.2%	Down from 12.9%	10.3%	12.2%
Older than usual for grade	8.1%	Down from 8.2%	8.1%	10.1%
Suspended or expelled	4.0%	Up from 2.3%	2.3%	2.3%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	40.0%	N/A	N/A	10.2%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Annual dropout rate	2.3%	Up from 1.5%	2.8%	2.7%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	0.0%	No change	2.3%	3.2%
Enrollment in career/technology center courses	175	Down from 414	796	433
Students participating in worked-based experiences	0.0%	Down from 7.3%	24.8%	26.3%
Career/technology students mastering core competencies	79.4%	Up from 72.5%	76.4%	74.9%
Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	100.0%	99.5%

Teachers (n= 71)				
Teachers with advanced degrees	43.7%	Up from 43.5%	54.0%	51.7%
Continuing contract teachers	83.1%	Up from 78.3%	83.1%	81.8%
Highly qualified teachers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teachers returning from previous year	83.2%	No change	86.3%	85.1%
Teacher attendance rate	98.5%	No change	95.7%	95.8%
Average teacher salary	\$39,459	Up 4.7%	\$40,632	\$40,303
Prof. development days/teacher	10.6 days	Up from 6.6 days	8.6 days	10.3 days

School				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	3.5	3.0
Student-teacher ratio	28.3 to 1	Down from 28.4 to 1	28.3 to 1	26.2 to 1
Prime instructional time	94.6%	Up from 94.2%	91.3%	90.1%
Dollars spent per pupil*	\$5,263	Down 3.3%	\$5,420	\$6,279
Percent spent on teacher salaries*	60.2%	No change	58.3%	57.8%
Opportunities in the arts	Excellent	No change	Excellent	Excellent
Parents attending conferences	26.7%	Down from 59.5%	87.5%	87.8%
SACS accreditation	yes	N/A	yes	yes

* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

	Our District	State
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A

Abbreviations for Missing Data							
N/A	Not Applicable	N/C	Not Collected	N/R	Not Reported	I/S	Insufficient Sample

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

J. L. Mann Academy's School Improvement Council goals for 2002-03 were established with input from council members, the School Management Team, and various staff sub-committees. Objective data (such as previous years' test scores) and subjective considerations (assessments of current facilities and teaching methods) were utilized. Priority goals included: raise the academic challenge and performance of each student; implement a program for all students based on relevant academic and occupational curriculum as defined in the School-to-Work Transition Act of 1994; provide enhanced communication within the school and between the school and community.

Student success was reflected in Mann's rank of 345 in Newsweek's Top 600 High Schools in the U.S., based on AP enrollment compared to the number of graduating seniors. The number of students participating in senior internships increased, as did the number of students attending career centers to pursue work-related studies. Off-site meetings as well as traditional on-site programs, accessible email, and a monthly state award winning PTSA newsletter improved communication between staff, parents, and the community. Emphasis on "Patriot PRIDE" (performance, respect, integrity, determination, enthusiasm), offerings of a wide variety of courses, dedicated teachers, and the purchase of additional technology to meet student demand proved to be successful strategies in accomplishing these results. Student-teacher ratios that increase yearly, the age of the physical facility, and lack of state and county funding continue to be barriers to even greater success at our school.

In planning for 2003-04, Mann will continue to offer a strong curriculum for all students, striving to employ the most qualified teachers available in all subject areas. Plans are underway for a new campus with an anticipated completion by the fall of 2006. For the second year in a row, Mann received Absolute and Improvement ratings of Excellent on the school report card. Mann was also named a recipient of the S.C. Palmetto Gold Award. Faculty, students, parents, and community members are putting forth tremendous efforts to ensure that J. L. Mann Academy will be widely recognized as one of the best high schools in the southeast by 2005.

Susan F. Hughes, Principal

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS

	Teachers	Students	Parents
Number of surveys returned	42	220	76
Percent satisfied with learning environment	87.8%	77.5%	89.2%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	82.9%	84.3%	64.0%
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	92.7%	89.4%	77.3%

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- **Excellent** - School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Good** - School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Average** - School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Below Average** - School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Unsatisfactory** - School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.